

S P E E C H  
OF  
MR. JOSEPH H. PEYTON, OF TENNESSEE,  
ON  
THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, June 5, 1844.

Mr. PEYTON, who, though deeply averse to speaking, excused himself for doing so on the ground that it would be expected of him by his constituents; but since Mr. Clay, Mr. Van Buren, and Mr. Polk, had been brought into the debate by other gentlemen, he should claim to follow in the footsteps of his "illustrious predecessors."

Mr. Clay had been traduced and vilified by all who had spoken from the Democratic side of the House. He had been compared by Mr. RATHBUN, of New York, to Cæsar, to Caligula, and to Cromwell. He asked all to look at his acts, to contemplate his public history, and to look at the conduct of those of the party who opposed him, and then say which were the acts of a Cromwell. He asked who it was that had been, at the commencement of this Congress, in favor of maintaining the majesty and supremacy of the laws? The Whig party, with Mr. Clay at its head. On the other hand, who were they who had come up into this hall, and by a sweeping vote nullified the districting law? And who were they who at this very hour held seats here directly in the teeth of law? Who had carried out those doctrines of nullification which South Carolina had only threatened, and openly trampled the Constitution under foot? The Democratic party.

Look at one of the first acts of this Congress, immediately after its organization. The Journal of the House, the record of its proceedings, had been deliberately mutilated, by order of a Democratic majority. The Whigs had entered their solemn protest against the right of the nullifying recusants to seats in this House, and placed that protest on the journal; but where was it? It had, by an unconstitutional order, been stricken from its place, and was no more to be found there. Yet he talked about Caligulas!

Mr. P. then referred to the proceedings of the Senate of Tennessee. The Whigs in that State had a majority of votes on joint ballot, and Senators of the United States for that State had always been thus elected. But a set of men now characterized there and elsewhere as "the immortal thirteen," of which his colleague (Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON) was one, after having twice so voted, (for Felix Grundy,) as soon as it was found that there was a majority for Whig Senators, suddenly declared that mode of electing Senators to be unconstitutional; and so great were their qualms of conscience, that when the vote was to be taken, they stubbornly retained their seats, and thereby prevented the election, and kept their State unrepresented in the other branch of the National Legislature. It is a little remarkable, that the consciences of gentlemen should have been so quiet when voting for Mr. Grundy, and that they should have been so much disturbed when called upon to vote for a Whig under precisely similar circumstances.

These (Mr. P. said) were some of the tendencies of the Democratic

party. A gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DUNCAN) had made a speech, not long since, in which he represented the Whigs about the city of Cincinnati as a set of swindlers, cut-throats, and traitors; and had observed that it was the native *tendency* of Whiggery to lead to corruption, anarchy, and despotism. Mr. P. had therefore presented a specimen of the tendencies of this—not Jeffersonian, no, but this—modern, this latter-day, this Joe Smith, this barn-burning, this Dorrite Democracy, which held that the people had a right to act in masses against both law and Constitution. These “immortal thirteen” in Tennessee had nullified the action of their own legislative body. Here was one of the tendencies of modern Democracy.

As to the Democracy of “Governor Dorr,” its whole history was one of the most infamous affairs that disgraced the annals of our country. His party claimed the right in their unorganized mass, as the great magazine of all power, to change laws and overturn constitutions at will; and, when offered the very things they desired, scorned to receive them through either legislature or convention. There was no perceptible difference as to the latitude of suffrage, or any other democratic right, between the constitution they attempted to frame and that agreed to in a lawful assembly; yet they would not take it, because it came from the hands of the constituted authorities. Yet the Democratic party were ready to back them, and did vote them countenance and aid in proceedings more anarchical than any in the days of Danton, Marat, or Robespierre. When this doctrine prevails, your laws, your constitutions, vested rights, rights of property, marriage contracts, the peace and order of society, will depend upon the whim, the passion, and the caprice of the hour. The prevalence of such a doctrine would be the death knell of liberty, and would at once resolve society into its original elements, when brute strength, rapine, and violence, would usurp the place of justice, order, and civil government.

As to the charge of Federalism, which had been brought against the Whigs, who, he asked, were they who were in favor of giving to the President the kingly power of destroying the legislation of both Houses of Congress at his mere will and pleasure? Was it the Whigs? Mr. Clay was against this power. He held that ought to be the law of the land which the People's Representatives in both branches of the Legislature declared should be the law; but the Democrats *par excellence* were for vesting all power in one man, and allowing him to cut off the heads of as many legislative acts as might suit his own notions or selfish purposes. Of these two classes of politicians, which were the Federalists and which the Republicans?

But to quit principles, and go a little into the *personnel* of Federalism. Where were the Federalists actually found? He referred to the old anti-war Federalists!

He would begin with James Buchanan; and what had been his sentiments? He says:

“The Democratic Administration declared war against commerce. They were not satisfied with depriving it of the protection of a navy, but they acted as though they had determined upon its annihilation.

“*Time will not allow me to enumerate all the other wild and wicked acts of the Democratic Administration.*

“After they had, by refusing the Bank of the United States continuance of its charter, embarrassed the financial concerns of the Government, **THEY RASHLY PLUNGED US INTO A WAR.**

"Glorious it has been in the highest degree to the American character, *but disgraceful in the extent to the Administration.*

"Thanks, then, to Heaven, that we have obtained a peace, *bad and disgraceful as it is.*

"They (the Democrats) *gloried in setting themselves in array against our present admirable form of Government.*"

*S D* "Reuel Williams, one of Mr. Van Buren's [late] United States Senators from Maine, in 1812, assisted to burn James Madison in *effigy.*"

"Garret D. Wall, [formerly] United States Senator from New Jersey, and Mr. Van Buren's bosom friend, made the following declaration on the floor of Congress:

"Here, sir, in the presence of the American people, I *avow* that I was a *Federalist*, and acted with that party zealously and actively so long as their flag waved in New Jersey."

"Henry Hubbard, another Senator of the same stamp, and who is now 'where he ever has been, and ever means to be,' was a prime mover in getting up the meeting in New Hampshire which sent delegates to the Hartford Convention."

Another very distinguished gentleman in the Democratic ranks, and now a prominent member of Congress, Charles Jared Ingersoll, had declared that, "had he been capable of reason and reflection during the revolutionary war he should have been a *Tory.*"

That gentleman was most courteous in his deportment, and had always treated Mr. P. with the utmost personal kindness. He meant him no offence or injury; and if the assertion he had now made was incorrect, he (Mr. P.) would instantly take it back. The gentleman was present, and could deny it if it was untrue. [Mr. I. retained his seat.]

John H. Prentiss, one of Mr. Van Buren's members of Congress from the State of New York, [in 1840,] published a Federal paper in Otsego, during the war. His political opinions may be gathered from the following extracts:

"It is with great sensation of indescribable pleasure that I find myself enabled to announce the complete triumph of the Federalists." "If my humble labors in the cause of my native country have produced the change in favor of Federalism in this country, then have I arrived at the acme of my hopes, the summit of my wishes." "The frightful Hydra of Democracy begins to droop its head before the Heaven-derived spirit of Federalism."—"Democracy! a monster wild as that which roams the Lybian wastes, and joys to drench his tusks in blood—a pestilence that spreads contagion over the whole extent of our country—a pernicious blast, that withers every thing it touches."

Wm. Cullen Bryant, editor of the New York Evening Post, the leading Van Buren print in New York, once gave the following poetical portraiture of Thomas Jefferson :

"And thou, the scorn of every patriot's name,  
Thy country's ruin, and her council's shame!  
Poor servile thing! derision of the brave!  
Who erst from Tarleton fled to Carter's cave;  
Thou, who, when menaced by perfidious Gaul,  
Did prostrate to her whiskered minions fall,  
And when our cash her empty bags supplied,  
Did meanly strive the foul disgrace to hide;  
Go, wretch, resign the presidential chair,  
Disclose thy secret measures, foul or fair,  
Go, search with curious eye for horned frogs,  
'Mid the wild wastes of Louisiana bogs;  
Or, where the Ohio rolls its turbid stream,  
Dig for huge bones, thy glory and thy theme,  
Go, scan, Philosopher, thy —— charms,  
And sink supinely in her sable arms,  
But quit to abler hands the helm of State,  
Nor image ruin on thy country's fate."

"Samuel Harker, editor of the Baltimore Republican, and formerly editor of the Gazette, printer of the laws of the present reign, a citizen

diary, and notorious as the author of the insult from whence sprang into existence the ‘Log Cabin devices,’ which so perplex our opponents, declared, in 1837, that he would ‘never ask forgiveness for the political sin which stamped upon him the name of Federalist; *we delight in the name.*’”

Again, in 1838, he said :

“To us, the name of FEDERALISM is a subject of no reproach. *We rejoice to hear it, and hope* that our efforts to honor and support it may be such as it merits. While others are endeavoring to hold it up to scorn, and are deserting its standard for the purpose of securing power and emolument from other hands, it shall be our glory to support its cause, and our feeble powers shall always be employed to display its beauties to others.”

Now, then, he would again inquire, where was Federalism to be found? He thought he had placed it on the right side of the party line.

[Mr. INGERSOLL here asking the loan of the book from which the above quotations had been made, Mr. P. replied: “Take good care of it, and do not derange its contents; it is an excellent magazine of Whig ammunition, and I mean to draw on it for some missiles, I hope, to hurl at the *polk stalks* of Tennessee.”]

And now as to this farce of a nomination at Baltimore. A distinguished gentleman from New York so denominated it publicly, and without the slightest reserve; declared openly that it ought to meet with no respect from the country, and that James K. Polk could not get one electoral college, unless that of South Carolina, and that would depend on the mere whim and caprice of John C. Calhoun.

[This annunciation produced very great sensation in the House.]

Mr. STETSON, of New York, inquired of Mr. P. who the New York member referred to was.

Mr. PEYTON replied, that for the name of the gentleman, and all the circumstances, he would refer the gentleman to the Hon. Mr. BLACK, of South Carolina. He would tell him who he was.

Mr. STETSON repeated his inquiry, observing that the statement had taken him completely by surprise.

[Mr. BLACK, of South Carolina, advanced across the Hall to the position occupied by Mr. P., and requested Mr. P. to repeat the language alleged to have been used; which Mr. P. did, and Mr. B. bowed assent, and returned to his seat.]

Mr. PEYTON replied, it was a member on this floor, a distinguished member of the House, a great friend to Mr. Van Buren, and, in fact, considered as his right-hand man here. That gentleman had declared that Mr. Polk could not get the vote of one electoral college, unless in South Carolina, and that depended on the whim and caprice of John C. Calhoun. If the gentleman would apply to the honorable gentleman from South Carolina, his political friend, who was good democratic authority, he could get all the information he desired.

Mr. P. was about proceeding in his speech, when

Mr. STETSON again interposed, (Mr. P. not yielding the floor,) and said that, as Mr. P. was the only one who had referred to the member from the New York delegation, it was to him alone he ought to apply for his name.

Mr. PEYTON said he would not be thus interrupted: there was a point where courtesy ceased to be a virtue.

A majority of the members of the late convention went to Baltimore instructed and pledged to vote for Mr. Van Buren; and the Globe, before the convention assembled, charged whoever should do otherwise with treachery. And what was the result? A majority did vote for Mr. Van

Buren ; but for this most *Democratic assembly* a simple majority was not enough. True, Thomas Jefferson thought a majority ought to rule, and held the maxim, *vox populi vox Dei*, from which there was no appeal but to arms, which he held to be the appeal of tyrants. But these Democrats were not content with Jeffersonian Democracy. A bare majority was not enough for them ; they must have two-thirds. A gentleman (Mr. McCLEERNAND, of Illinois) said, that, with the Texas feeling in his favor, their candidate would get the votes of a majority of the people of the United States. A majority ! Suppose he did, that would not do. According to the doctrine of the late Baltimore convention, he must have two-thirds to elect him. He hoped gentlemen would carry out their principles.

The nomination of James K. Polk would fall on the ears of the people of this country like a thunder clap from a clear sky. No ; that was too grand, too terrific, a figure. The idea is better illustrated by a line from an ancient author : “*Parturunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.*” The mountain is in labor, but a ridiculous mouse comes forth ! James K. Polk a candidate for the Presidency ! A man never dreamed of, and (if we were to believe the *Globe*) a man not qualified for the place. There had been, in that paper, a recent war between a Tennessee Democrat and an Alabama Democrat. One of these excellent Democrats was opposed to Mr. King as a candidate for the Vice Presidency, because he had not signalized himself in Congress during the war, and left no memorials to distinguish his name. The other (the Alabama Democrat) tauntingly observed, that this came with a bad grace from one who advocated James K. Polk, whom he charged, in substance, with being a coward, and unworthy of being Vice President on that ground ; and, in support of the charge, brought up a scene between Mr. Polk, when Speaker, and Mr. Wise, of Virginia, who, as they were retiring from this Hall, took him by the arm, and said : “ You are the contemptible tool of a petty tyrant.” The question would then seem very naturally to arise, if Mr. Polk was too much of a coward to be Vice President, is he fit to be commander-in-chief of the army and navy ? He proclaimed himself for annexation. Now, suppose annexation should lead to war : would the Alabama Democracy support such a candidate to be commander-in-chief of the army and navy ?

*Extract from an article published in the Globe of January 19, 1844, in reply to “A Tennessee Democrat.”*

“ But why attack Colonel King ? Why advert to his earliest legislative history ? Does he feel that the political capital of Governor Polk is quite too limited to secure a nomination from the Republican party, unless he can pull down the fame of others whose shadow has fallen across the path of his posthumous bantling for the Vice Presidency ? If so, let me warn ‘A Tennessee Democrat’ that his disparagement of Colonel King will add nothing to the political capital of Governor Polk.

“ But if he will convince me that there is a well-founded suspicion—a reasonable doubt—of the personal courage of Colonel King, I pronounce him, without hesitation or qualification, totally unfit for the office of Vice President of the United States. I care not how honorable a man may be, if he is a coward he *cannot maintain* his honor ; and hence it is *such a man* is disqualified for the office of Vice President.

“ Now, sir, Colonel King has never been insulted day after day ; and, above all, he was never caught roughly by the arm, when escaping from the Capitol, pulled round, and told that he was the ‘*contemptible tool* of a petty tyrant !’ I pledge my head, if he is ever so treated, he will resent the insult in the proper way. Will ‘A Tennessee Democrat’ do the same in regard to Governor Polk ?

“ What are the facts in regard to Governor Polk ? He has been twice *repudiated* in his own State by large majorities—defeated by an inexperienced politician ; and it is not pretended that his name would add one *particle* of strength to the ticket in any State of this Union. Why, then, talk of *his* selection as the candidate of the party ?

“ Again we are told : ‘If, on the contrary, you do not run Governor Polk, you may lose Tennessee.’ Will the selection of Governor Polk prevent that result ? He has been run twice for Governor of that State lately, and has been defeated both times most signally. This would seem to be conclusive that Tennessee *cannot be carried* by the Democracy if Governor Polk is upon the

ticket. If this be a legitimate conclusion, it is due to the principles we profess, not to jeopard their success by *rain attempts to force upon the people of Tennessee* a man whom they have twice refused to honor, notwithstanding the supposed ‘deep, bold, and lasting impress left by Governor Polk on our public affairs.’

“The truth is, it will not do. Governor Polk has no greater claims upon the people of this Union than any other man of equal ability who has faithfully maintained the principles of his party. There are now at least one hundred men in the Union who have served their party as long, as ably, and as faithfully as Governor Polk; whose claims are fully equal in every respect to his, but whose names have never been mentioned in connexion with the Vice Presidency, and possibly never will be.

“I therefore respectfully suggest to ‘A Tennessee Democrat’ to abandon that system of puffing, blowing, and swelling, by which a toad may be magnified into the dimensions of an ox; or, if he still wishes to persevere, let him do so upon the merits of his own *subject*, and not upon the demerits of others.”

These were Mr. Polk’s qualifications in a military point of view. What were his political? Why, he had been found, during his public career, on both sides of almost every important question. Had he originated or given a prominent and leading support to any great measure, or any great and controlling system of policy? None. He had never risen higher than to be a mere second-rate man—a tool and follower of some great man. This had been his character all his life. He had been the instrument and subservient tool of Andrew Jackson, to do his bidding, whatever that might be. Never had he been found one-thousandth part of an inch from Jackson’s track, wind and turn as it might. However contradictory his measures or opinions might be, those were the measures and those the opinions of the obedient Mr. Polk.

He had been strongly opposed to the sub-Treasury, and preferred State banks as places of deposite for the public money. He considered them safer, and in all respects to be preferred. Where did he stand now? Now the sub-Treasury was the only safe place.

Mr. P. had within his reach, though not here, a very precious document concerning this same J. K. Polk—an extract from a circular which Governor Polk published—in which he came out in favor of the constitutionality and expediency of works of internal improvement by the General Government within the States. Now he is opposed to it. He was just so in regard to every thing. This is the champion the great Democratic party had brought out for the four-mile heat in the great contest next fall! A little, broken-down, twice-distanced, *shuffling poney* of Tennessee, to run against the great American Eclipse! [Much laughter, and some punning among the Democratic members.] There was a turning up of the nose, a sense of the ridiculous, in the bare idea of the parallel. One had been identified with all the great events and measures in our political history for the last 40 years. A man—ay, every inch a man—in heart and intellect, in firmness, grasp, and comprehension of mind—a whole head and shoulders above any man that ever had made a foot-print on this continent, save one. There’s the exception, (pointing to the portrait of Washington.) When the tyrant power of Great Britain was seizing our citizens, and confining them in the loathsome dungeon of a prison-ship, whose voice was it that sounded in thunder tones of indignation through the land, loud and long and deep, till the whole country was roused to resistance and war. Henry Clay’s. And when another crisis (the Missouri question) arose in our affairs—a crisis which shook the Government of the country to its centre, which caused the good man and the patriot to turn pale, and Jefferson himself to declare that it fell upon him like an alarm bell in the dead hour of night, who was it that came to the rescue, threw himself into the breach, and saved his country? Henry Clay. And then, in that other

critical and trying hour, when the flag of disunion was raised in South Carolina, and the laws of the Union were resisted at the cannon's mouth, while we had in the chair of state a man of iron nerve and lion heart, who swore by the Eternal that the laws should be executed, and that if one gun was fired by South Carolina, "he would hang Calhoun and McDuffie, and Hayne and Hamilton, and the other leaders of the rebellion, as high as Haman," who was it that came again as our deliverer, with a heart deeply penetrated by the crisis of his country's fate, and, casting on the issue all he held dear in life, once more, by his prudence, moderation, and skill, assuaged the angry elements, and rescued this fair land from the horrors of civil discord? It was Henry Clay. When the hour of danger came, there was he; and wherever he came, danger departed, disorder fled, and public prosperity smiled upon her restorer. Now, look upon this picture and then upon that—the counterfeit presentment of two candidates. " 'Tis Hyperion to a Satyr." As well compare a "mousing owl" to the imperial bird of Jove, that springs aloft and soars into the very sun.

Mr. P. wished to say a few more words on this General Polk—no, not General, he never rose quite as high as that.

A voice. "Colonel Polk."

Another voice. "Governor Polk."

A third voice. "President Polk."

Well, Governor Polk, then, said Mr. P. He had a document in his hand which would show what were General Jackson's sentiments in relation to a protective tariff, so vehemently opposed by Mr. Polk. He would read it:

*Extract of a letter from Andrew Jackson to Dr. L. H. Coleman, of Warrington, North Carolina.*

"WASHINGTON CITY, April 26, 1824.

"Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defence. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us, we deserve not the continuation of His blessing. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the great materials of our national defence, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection: that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war.

"I will ask, what is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus produce? Except for cotton, he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture? Common sense at once points out the remedy. Take from agriculture in the United States six hundred thousand men, women, and children, and you will at once give a market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us. In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more *Americanized*, and instead of feeding paupers and laborers of England, feed our own; or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves. It is therefore my opinion that a careful and judicious tariff is much wanted to pay our national debt, and to afford us the means of that defence within ourselves on which the safety of our country and liberty depends; and last, though not least, give a proper distribution to our labor, which must prove beneficial to the happiness, independence, and wealth of the community.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

"ANDREW JACKSON."

These were those declarations of General Jackson which a certain member near him had imbodyed in a resolution, and asked this Democratic House to adopt, as expressing its sentiments. And who were they who had shrunk from such a motion as from the mouth of a cannon? Where were the Jackson men on that memorable occasion? Not one of them—no, not one—would stand up to do honor to the sentiments of his chief. The only friends the old hero had in the House that day were the Whigs.

... no could ever forget the scene? Mr. P. had often witnessed great confusion in that House, but never had he seen consternation like that. What running to and fro! what countenances! what consultations! If a ghost had risen through the floor, or a bomb shell had fallen upon it, scattering its death-dealing fragments in every direction, there could not have been witnessed a greater exhibition of horror. They were alike afraid to adopt the resolutions or to reject them, lest they should be committed on the one hand—or on the other should seem to run off from their great man. But such was modern Democracy! Such were Democratic metamorphoses. Modern Democracy had well and wisely been declared to be “progressive”—a sort of migratory thing—its track like the track of a snake.

*“It wobbles in and wobbles out,  
And left the people all in doubt,  
Whether the snake that made the track,  
Was going south or coming back.”*

These opinions of General Jackson are fully sustained by the wise and good men who formed our noble institutions.

In his annual message to Congress, January, 1790, General Washington holds the following language:

“The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, particularly for military supplies.”

In various messages General Washington uses similar language; but I pass over them, and come to his message of the 7th December, 1796. He says:

“Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the *encouragement of manufactures*. The object is of too much consequence not to ensure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.”

Mr. Madison, in his special message to Congress of the 20th of February, 1815, holds this language:

“There is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress, than a consideration of the means *to preserve and promote the manufactures* which have sprung into existence, and attained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States, during the period of the European wars. *This source of national independence and wealth* I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress.”

We now come to Mr. Monroe. He says in his message of the 7th of December, 1819:

“Uniformity in the demand and price of an article is highly desirable to the domestic manufacturer. *It is deemed of great importance to give encouragement to our domestic manufactures*. In what manner the evils adverted to may be remedied, and how far it may be practicable in other respects to afford them *further encouragement*, is submitted to the wisdom of Congress.”

*Extract of a letter from Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Benjamin Austin, dated January 9, 1816.*

“We have since experienced what we did not then believe—that there exist both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that, to be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form: the grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them, at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture, must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort; and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign, where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without any regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has so long wantonly violated it.”

These are the opinions of the fathers of our institutions. But his colleague (Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON) in a speech made in the House on the 22d of May, on the naval appropriation bill, and reported in the Globe of that

day, (see *Appendix*,) contended that the tariff is an oppressive and iniquitous mode of taxation. He says the duty is always added to the price of the article. If this were so, the price of the article would be increased to the amount of the duty. Now for the facts. Have prices risen since the passage of the tariff of 1842? Here is a table, with some remarks by one of the Democratic members on this floor from Pennsylvania, (Mr. BROADHEAD,) showing the effect of the tariff of 1842 upon iron and coal, the great staple articles of that State:

*Extract from a speech of Mr. Broadhead on the tariff, April 27, 1844.*

"I am prepared to show that the price of coal and iron is now less than it was before the passage of the act of 1842, which increased the duty from \$1 26 to \$1 75 per ton on coal, and on iron in about the same proportion."

"Now, sir, here are the prices at which it (coal) sold before and after the passage of the act of 1842, in the principal markets :

Year.	Philadelphia.	New York.	Boston.
1841	\$5 50	\$7 50	\$7 00
1842	5 00	6 12½	6 25
1843	4 25	4 50	6 00
1844	4 00	4 25	5 75

"The same thing may be said in regard to iron and other products of domestic manufacture. I have a table before me, showing the prices of iron from 1794 to the present time, by which it appears that Pennsylvania iron was never as cheap as it is now. These statements show that, in regard to any production of industry, when the supply of the raw material is ample, the ingenuity, industry, and enterprise of our people, will, by the effects of domestic competition, bring down the price to the consumer to the lowest point at which human labor can effect the object without loss; and that very shortly after the dread of foreign interference is taken away. The iron men of this country have always had to contend with a heavy, and sometimes ruinous competition, caused by the large amount of the poor English article brought into our markets. So, too, with our mechanics. Our people engaged in the coal trade cannot compete with the English and Welch coal, if the duty is reduced nearly one-half, as is proposed by the present bill, and will be obliged to resign our markets to foreigners; and then the price will go up to eight or ten dollars per ton again."

Mr. P. continued : Here is another table, exhibited by Mr. BIDLACK, another Democratic member from Pennsylvania, in his speech on the tariff, May 1, 1844 :

"The inexhaustible stores of iron and coal spread throughout the vast expanse of this wide Republic will always prevent any danger of combinations among the domestic producers to demand unfair prices from the community. The present tariff may have lessened importations, and thereby given a more extensive home market to our producers, and thus operated to their advantage; but that it has not enhanced the prices, will appear from the following extracts from the commercial list of Mr. Childs :

"Turn to August, 1841 and 1842, and February, 1844, and give us the prices of iron at the said dates, respectively. I have it, sir; and answer as follows :

*August 21, 1841—before the tariff.*

English bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	\$75 00 to \$82 50	per ton.
American bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	72 50 to 77 50	"
American bar iron, rolled	-	-	-	-	-	75 00 to 82 50	"

*August 6, 1842.*

English bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	65 00 to 67 50	"
American bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	72 50 to 75 00	"
American bar iron, rolled	-	-	-	-	-	80 00 to 85 00	"

*February 10, 1844—since the tariff.*

English bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	60 00 to 65 00	"
American bar iron	-	-	-	-	-	70 00 to 75 00	"
American bar iron, rolled	-	-	-	-	-	65 00 to 70 00	"

"The two former dates show the prices of iron prior to the commencement of the present tariff, and the latter date shows the price now, while the tariff is in full operation. The result is, that iron is cheaper now than it was before the present 'heavy duty' was laid upon it!"

Mr. P. said, this was good *Democratic proof* that the tariff of 1842 had not increased the price of iron or coal. What had been its effect upon other articles?

	Duty.	Price.
Cheese	9 cents per lb.	5 cents per lb.
Lead	3 cents per lb.	$3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb.
Nails	3 cents per lb.	$4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb.
Common shirting	6 cents per yard	6 cents per yard.
Sheeting	6 cents per yard	from 4 to 7 cents per yard.

(Taken from Boston price current.)

What, then, became of his colleague's theory, that the duty is always added to the price? What became of his wild calculations, that the tariff imposed a burden of many millions of dollars upon the American people, and near \$100,000 annually upon the people of Tennessee. Mr. P. said, that the impression had heretofore prevailed, that figures could not lie. He greatly feared that the calculations of *modern Democracy* had gone very far to bring figures into disrepute, and to undermine the broad basis of mathematics itself. His colleague had said, if laying on heavy duties will bring down the price of manufactures, increase them, and the manufacturer would finally, under this process, have to sell his goods for nothing. Mr. P. said, this was not the first instance of the absurd conclusions of the syllogistic mode of reasoning. By assuming false premises you can prove any thing. An enemy to our institutions might say that General Washington was a great tyrant; that all tyrants ought to be beheaded: therefore, General Washington ought to have been beheaded. But, since his colleague seemed to be fond of this mode of reasoning, he would give him a specimen in his own vein. He is opposed to the tariff—thinks that, the lower the duty, the lower the price of goods. Then, sir, you have nothing to do but to keep lowering the duty until you come down to the free trade point, and you get the goods for nothing. Mr. P. said, it was a bad rule that would not work both ways; and thus, he met one absurdity with another. Mr. P. said, it was the competition between our own manufacturers, and between them and the manufacturers abroad, that brought down the price of goods. It was one of the happy effects of this policy, (the tariff,) that while it brought down the price of goods to the consumer, it afforded a home market for our agricultural productions, more valuable than all the markets of the world put together, and threw a shield around our domestic labor against the pauper labor of Europe. Would his colleague bring down the honest, independent mechanic of our country to a level with the half-clothed, half-fed paupers of England, France, and Germany, where there is a perpetual struggle to keep starvation from the door? Suppose he strikes down the tariff, and lets the products of this kind of labor in upon our country: would he not compel our mechanic at once to sell the products of his labor as cheap as they do? And if he sells as cheap, must he not live as cheap? Would he be willing to reduce the proud, the free mechanic of this country to such a fate? Would he have him to lie on a bed of straw, or dirt floor—work 16 hours a day for 8 or 10 cents—and see his little shivering, ragged children around him, crying and starving for bread? Unless he is prepared for this, let him not be willing to remove all protection from American labor; for it must follow, “as the night the day,” if the tariff is destroyed, and free trade introduced in its stead, our mechanics must be borne down and ruined by this pauper competition of Europe. Mr. P. here exhibited a table of the wages of labor in Europe, as follows:

Country and district.	Description of laborers.			Yearly wages.	Daily wages.	With or without board.	With or without dwelling.
<i>France.</i>							
Calais -	Ploughmen -	-	-	\$5 to \$8	-	With -	With.
	Shepherds -	-	-	13	-		
	Laborers -	-	-	-	15 cents.		
Boulogne -	Ploughmen -	-	-	7	-	With -	Without.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	10	Without -	Without.
Havre -	Farm servants generally -	-	-	8 to 12	-	With -	With.
Brest -	Farm servants generally -	-	-	2 to 6	-	With -	With.
Nantes -	Laborers -	-	-	-	17	Without -	Without.
Charente -	Farm servants generally -	-	-	3 to 8	-	With -	With.
Bordeaux -	Laborers -	-	-	-	24 to 30	Without -	Without.
Bayonne -	Laborers -	-	-	-	18 to 12	Without -	Without.
Marseilles -	Shepherds -	-	-	10 to 12	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	9 to 14	With -	With.
Corsica -	Laborers -	-	-	-	22	Without -	Without.
<i>Germany.</i>							
Dantzig -	Farm servants -	-	-	3 to 4	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	9 to 14	Without -	With.
Mecklenberg -	Farm servants -	-	-	5	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	14	Without -	With.
Holstein -	Farm servants -	-	-	4 to 5	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	14	Without -	With.
<i>Netherlands—</i>							
South Holland	Farm servants -	-	-	10 to 12	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	12 to 32	Without -	Without.
West Flanders	Farm servants -	-	-	5	-	With -	With.
<i>Italy.</i>							
Trieste -	Laborers -	-	-	-	24	Without -	Without.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	12	With -	With.
Istria -	Laborers -	-	-	-	16 to 20	Without -	Without.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	8 to 10	With -	With.
Lombardy -	Laborers -	-	-	-	8 to 16	With -	With.
Genoa -	Farm servants -	-	-	4 to 5	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	10 to 16	With -	Without.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	-	Without -	Without.
Tuscany -	Farm servants -	-	-	2	-	With -	With.
	Laborers -	-	-	-	12	Without -	Without.

Would his colleague be willing to see the tailors struggling against such competition as this? In his speech, the other day, he took occasion to allude to the circumstance of his connexion with that class of mechanics; and here, Mr. P. said, he took great pleasure in bearing his humble testimony of the respectability of that class of the mechanics of our country. He numbered many of them in his district, among his warm personal and political friends, and there was no part of the community more honest or more intelligent. If his colleague should succeed in breaking down the tariff, and letting in that flood of goods, of every description, that would rush in from England, France, and Germany, what would become of the tailors? Would not every city, town, village, and hamlet, in this country, be packed with ready-made clothing from cellar to rafters? Could our tailors sell their labor at these reduced prices? No. What would they do, then? They would be compelled to give up their business; they would be turned out of house and home, to wander about, dependent upon the

cold charity of the world, or to learn new trades, (perhaps in their old age,) and for which their previous habits totally disqualified them. Such would be the inevitable effect of this system of free trade and direct taxation upon the mechanics of our country. As he had observed, the fathers of our Republic thought very differently from his colleague: they thought that our farmers, our mechanics and manufacturers, should be protected, sustained, and made independent of the whole world. They set this great protective system in motion. It has been in operation for more than fifty years—and what has been the result? Are there any privileged classes, any distinctions, any aristocracy, here? None, none whatever. We all stand on one common level—mechanic and professional man; and there is no passport to favor, affection, or distinction, but that which is won by honesty, integrity, and talent. Our glorious ancestors acknowledged no distinctions; all classes put their shoulders to the revolutionary wheel, and none pushed harder, or with more effect, than did the shoemaker, the wagoner, the blacksmith, and the printer, in the persons of the illustrious Sherman, Morgan, Greene, and Franklin. His colleague was himself a strong illustration of the excellence of our institutions, and the happy results of that policy which our fathers taught and practised. He, sir, has thrown aside his shears, his thimble, and his goose, and occupies a seat on this floor—one of the proudest stations that the ambition of man can aspire to. This reflected infinite credit upon him and the institutions of our beloved country; but he regretted that his colleague was so much mistaken in his duty (honestly no doubt) to the honorable calling to which he belongs, as to recommend a policy that would inevitably reduce the free and independent mechanics of this country to a level with the paupers of Europe.

His colleague had favored the House (in his speech on the naval appropriation bill) with a labored *argument* in favor of direct taxation, though he disclaimed being an *advocate* of it. In that speech he pointed out the many evils that would be avoided, and blessings secured to the country, and particularly to Tennessee, by a system of direct taxation. He had long since thought he could perceive a settled design, on the part of the leaders of *modern Democracy*, to saddle this odious system on this country, whenever they should think that it was safe to make the attempt. As an evidence that every quarter of the country was filled with Democratic advocates of this doctrine, he would read an extract from a speech of Mr. J. T. Stuart, of Illinois, on the tariff, July, 1842, and published in the Appendix to the Congressional Globe, pages 861, 862:

"During the progress of this debate, however, there has been much to induce the apprehension that it is seriously contemplated by the Democratic party to carry this odious system into practice whenever they may have the power of doing so. It has been advocated by the gentlemen from South Carolina, (Messrs. RIETT and PICKENS,) by the member from North Carolina, (Mr. DANIEL,) by the member from New York, (Mr. DAVIS,) by the member from New Hampshire, (Mr. BURKE,) and, at the commencement of this session by my colleague, (Mr. REYNOLDS.) Coming thus from members of that party, from every quarter of the Union, and from every section of the party, the country has much reason to apprehend that this will be another of the experiments of that party upon the institutions and established usages of the country."

The gentleman from Louisiana, (Mr. SLIDELL,) in his speech on the tariff, told us how superior this system of direct taxation was to all other systems, but concluded that it was unpopular now, and, of course, "out of the question." Hear what he said on this subject:

"Of all the modes of raising revenue, direct taxation, in the shape of an uniform percentage upon every species of property, real and personal, or upon income, is probably the most equitable that could be devised. It is the only means by which the rich can be made to pay their fair quota

for the support of the Government which protects them in the enjoyment of their property. It is certainly the system which would ensure the most economical administration; for all experience shows that a heavy indirect taxation is more cheerfully submitted to than a more moderate direct one. The same person who cheerfully, because unconsciously, pays dollars, in the shape of the enhanced price caused by imposts on articles of daily necessary consumption, would receive most ungraciously the visit of the national tax-gatherer for a much smaller sum; and in proportion to the grudging reluctance with which he paid the tax would be the watchful scrutiny with which he would criticise its expenditure.

"But, superior as the system may be in theory, there are many and fatal objections to it in practice. It would increase ten-fold the already dangerous and enormous patronage of the Federal Government; it would, indeed, render its influence all-pervading and irresistible. It would interfere with the peculiar sources of revenue of the States. It is opposed to the opinions, feelings, and prejudices of the people; and I am one of those who think that even their prejudices should be respected by a sage legislator. There is, however, one conclusive answer to the suggestion of direct taxation; if the alternative were presented to the people, certainly there is no State, probably not a district, in the Union, where a majority could be found in its favor. Whatever advance may hereafter be made in public opinion on this subject, direct taxation is, for the present, out of the question."

His colleague had approached this subject very cautiously; said he was no *advocate* for direct taxation, but he *argued* for it very strongly—a little stronger, no doubt, than his co-laborers in this deep, subtle game, thought was altogether prudent. But this was perhaps attributable to the warmth and excitement of debate, and an absence of that control over himself which a few years *here* might give him, and which might teach him a practical application of Talleyrand's definition of language: that it was designed to conceal men's thoughts. How can he fail to be an *advocate* of a policy that, he says, will save the country millions, and Tennessee several hundred thousands of dollars; which will prevent wild and corrupt expenditures of the public treasure, and which is to prevent ruinous, iniquitous, and oppressive taxation upon the mechanics and laboring classes of society? What! he observed, are we to be taught a system that will spread far and wide such invaluable blessings as these, and yet our teachers shrink back, and tell us that they are no *advocates* of such a system? There is something secret, hidden, mysterious, in this—"something rotten in Denmark." The pear is not yet ripe; the *Democracy* have never yet been sufficiently firm set in power to venture upon this odious system of *direct taxation*, or we should have had the *practice* as well as the theory long since. Mr. P. said his colleague had attempted to show, by a calculation, that Tennessee contributes \$1,700,000 to the National Treasury. He would say, for the sake of the argument, that it was one million. That State already paid three direct taxes—the State tax, of about \$100,000; the county tax, and a corporation tax. In the name of all that's charitable, said Mr. P., was this not *direct taxation enough*? Would the people of that State submit to an additional direct tax of \$1,000,000? How was Tennessee to pay this immense sum? Mr. P. said he would give the plan as proposed by two of Governor Polk's organs in Tennessee. Here is that of the Jackson Republican:

"Revenue from mules and horses	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$2,500,000
Do      neat cattle	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 1,000,000
Do      sheep	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 500,000
Do      swine	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 200,000
Do      land	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 12,000,000
Do      slaves	-	-	-	-	-	-	- 4,000,000
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>- 20,200,000"</u>

The Governor's organ (*Columbia Democrat*) in his own town had said: "Our interest is the same, whether the revenue is raised by direct taxes upon our property or by import duties upon the goods we consume." By

this system, it was clear that the tax would fall principally upon the farmer, whilst the rich capitalist, who lives upon his money, "clothes in fine linen and purple," and drinks his foreign wines, was not taxed at all. Mr. P. said the system of indirect taxation, or the tariff system, was the lightest, the most equal and just, that the wit of man had ever conceived of. By it, none paid the tax but those who consumed the goods. This was voluntary, the other (direct taxation) was involuntary. The tax must be paid by the farmer, whether he consumed foreign goods or not; and the plain cottager, who dressed in the "homespun," made by the hands of his thrifty wife, was doomed to pay a tax for the support of the General Government, upon his land, negroes, cattle, &c., while the *man of money*, who has no ostensible taxable property, goes free.

Mr. P. continued. The system we now had was given to us by our forefathers, and he trusted in God that it would never be changed. Sir, said he, let any Administration attempt to saddle a system of direct taxation upon the people of this country in a time of profound peace, and you will see such a commotion as no man ever beheld in this land before. It would shake the continent to its centre, and would probably end in revolution, anarchy, and civil war. He did not recollect any attempt to levy a direct tax for the support of the General Government in time of peace, since that which produced the rebellion in Pennsylvania. All, no doubt, recollect the whiskey tax, which was so stoutly resisted by the honest Dutch of the Keystone State. They resisted until the Government arrayed itself in arms against them; the militia were called out, and they were compelled to yield to the superior forces of the Federal Government. Yes, sir, (said Mr. P.,) and whenever it was attempted to collect the vast revenues of this great nation by direct taxation upon the people, you will find that not only the Dutch of Pennsylvania, but the Irish, Scotch, French, and Natives, every man that had an American heart in his breast, would resist it, and resist it to the knife, and the "knife to the hilt."

He asked, why were we called on to change our present admirable system for this odious mode of direct taxation? We now collect the taxes which support this Government by duties on foreign goods, imported into this country, principally from England, France, and Germany. And who is benefited, if we give up the tariff and adopt direct taxation? These foreign nations, of course. They flood our land with their goods free, break down all our domestic manufactures and our mechanics—charge us what they please for their goods—and the prosperity of our farmers and mechanics will be banished by the onerous direct taxation necessary for the support of their Government. This would be the result of the free trade, direct taxation policy to which the arguments of his colleague would lead. *Free trade*, indeed! Where is it to be found? No where, but in the distempered imaginations of some wild, visionary theorist. It would be free to foreigners, but how would it be to us? They would have all the benefit of the trade, while a mere abstraction of freedom would be left to us, without any of its realities. Do they give us free trade? Look at their tax upon our staple agricultural productions; it amounts almost to prohibition. They tax our tobacco 1,000 per cent.; England levies a duty of more than \$20,000,000 on our tobacco. Yes, sir, if a farmer from this country sends \$100 worth of tobacco to England, the tax on it is \$1,000. And yet we are called upon to open our ports to England and all the world—to invite them to come—come one, come all, and

fill our land with foreign goods, and you shall not be charged one cent for the privilege. Sir, (said Mr. P.,) this would look like there was springing up among us a *foreign party*, in favor of foreign Governments, and opposed to our own. It would seem to him that they could not have American hearts in their breasts, and advocate such doctrines. They had been "misborn," and ought to be transported beyond the Atlantic, to more congenial climes and Governments, among kings and queens and princes and potentates, where a privileged class "are born booted and spurred, ready to ride the people legitimately by the grace of God."

His colleague had said that no nation could prosper with the balance of trade against it. Let us see how this free-trade system, or that which had approached more nearly to it than any thing we have had in the last quarter of a century, had operated. The compromise act brought the duties down to a horizontal rate of 20 per cent. And when we were rapidly approaching that low rate of duty, what did Mr. Woodbury, Mr. Van Buren's great State financier, say in his report of 1840? Here it is :

"The difference between our exports and imports has usually been in favor of the latter. Several years ago it ranged that way about seven millions of dollars annually ; but, of late, the average has risen to near twenty millions annually ; the excess of imports having been, in 1836 even, \$61,316,995, and in 1839 \$41,063,716."

By this statement it appeared that in 1836 the balance of trade against us was upwards of \$61,000,000, and in 1839 upwards of \$41,000,000. Was there any wonder that we had been involved in a debt of \$200,000,000 to foreign countries ? In the short space of two years our imports exceeded our exports by \$102,000,000. Sir, said Mr. P., this was the result of a two-fold cause—the low tariff, inviting the goods of all foreign Governments to our shores ; and the "pet bank system," which stimulated credit to the highest possible pitch, and literally set the country on fire with the spirit of speculation. Who was responsible for this tremendous expansion of the credit system ? The self-styled Democratic party. For ten years preceding their war upon the United States Bank, there had been only twenty-two State banks chartered in the United States, with a capital of about \$8,000,000. In 1830, the banking capital of the whole country was only \$110,000,000, and the number of banks was about three hundred. In 1837, the number of banks had increased to 677, with an aggregate capital of \$378,000,000.

Here Mr. P. exhibited the political complexion of the Legislatures which had chartered those banks, by the following table :

*Number of banks chartered, and by whom chartered, from 1830 to 1837.*

STATES.	Jackson Legislatures.		Anti-Jackson Legislatures.	
	New banks.	Capital created.	New banks.	Capital created.
Maine -	-	41	\$3,485,000	
New Hampshire	-	5	871,638	
Vermont	-	-	-	20 \$1,767,375
Massachusetts	-	-	-	72 20,410,000
Rhode Island	-	9	1,500,000	9 2,482,605
Connecticut	-	9	1,100,495	9 2,933,636
New York	-	61	17,220,047	
New Jersey	-	8	5,458,000	
Pennsylvania*	-	17	44,048,149	
Delaware	-	-	-	
Maryland	-	15	22,924,505	
Virginia	-	-	1,140,200	
North Carolina,†	-	-		
South Carolina†	-	3	5,727,318	
Georgia	-	5	4,006,938	
Florida	-	8	9,725,000	
Alabama	-	1	14,208,466	
Louisiana	-	11	48,039,020	
Mississippi	-	10	20,450,000	
Tennessee	-	2	4,862,000	
Kentucky	-	-	-	4 9,264,640
Illinois	-	2	2,800,000	
Indiana	-	1	1,980,000	
Arkansas	-	2	3,500,000	
Ohio	-	21	11,445,614	
Michigan	-	16	7,400,000	
	247	231,892,390	114	37,225,431
	114	37,225,431		
	133	194,666,959		

\* Of the banking capital created by Pennsylvania, \$36,000,000 was for the United States Bank of that State.

† The banking capital of North Carolina was decreased \$595,000.

‡ The principal part of the increase was under the Calhoun administration.

And by whose counsel and advice were the Legislatures of the States stimulated, encouraged, and almost commanded, to engage in the race of competition which could charter the most banks and issue the largest quantity of bank paper? Let this circular of Mr. Taney, General Jackson's Secretary of the Treasury, and these extracts from the *Globe*, the organ of the then Administration, answer the question :

*Circular of the Secretary of the Treasury to the Deposite Banks.*

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, September 26, 1833.

"SIR : The Girard Bank has been selected by this department as the depository of the public money collected in Philadelphia and its vicinity.

"The deposits of the public money will enable you to afford increased facilities to commerce, and to extend your accommodations to individuals; and, as the duties which are payable to the Government arise from the business and enterprise of the merchants engaged in foreign trade, it is but reasonable that they should be preferred in the additional accommodations which the public deposits will enable your institutions to give, whenever it can be done without injustice to the claims of other classes of the community.

I am, &c.

"R. B. TANEY, Secretary of the Treasury.

"The PRESIDENT of the Girard Bank, Philadelphia."

*From the Globe of December 21, 1832.*

"The intelligent people of the West know how to maintain their rights and independence and to repel oppression. Although foiled in the beginning, every Western State *is about to establish a State bank institution.* They are resolved to avail themselves of their own State credit, as well as of the national credit, to *maintain a currency independent of foreign control.*"

And again :

"So Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Kentucky, are resolved to *take care of themselves.*"

And yet again, in connexion with the debts and expenditures of Pennsylvania, the *Globe* says :

"Why should not she *establish a bank of a large capital, in which she should be interested as the principal stockholder?* Such a bank, especially if the faith of the State were pledged for the redemption of its paper, would command universal confidence, and would doubtless become the depository of the public funds accumulated in Philadelphia."

Now, said Mr. P., we can clearly see how it was that the country has been involved in a debt to foreigners of \$200,000,000. It has been by the double stimulus of a low tariff and a flood of bank paper. If an individual buys more than he sells, he becomes involved in debt and embarrassment. It is so with a nation. If more goods are brought into the country than are sent out, the balance must be paid in specie, or its equivalent in the staple products of the country. Fortunately for our country, by the beneficial operation of the present tariff, the trade has been turned in our favor; and, instead of an annual balance against us of \$40,000,000, or \$60,000,000, the commercial document, which will soon be published, will exhibit about \$26,000,000 in our favor, and \$20,000,000 of that in specie. Official documents show that the importations of specie for the last year were \$23,000,000, and the exports \$3,000,000—a clear balance in our favor, in specie, of \$20,000,000. Mr. P. said he called upon every farmer and mechanic and professional man throughout the whole land to bear witness to this happy result of the tariff. And this, said he, is the system that the Democratic party, as they call themselves, with James K. Polk at their head, would break down, and let in a flood of trash from foreign countries, in the shape of goods, ruin our domestic manufactures, and involve the country again in debt and irretrievable embarrassment. Governor Polk is opposed to a protective tariff. He is for reducing it to what it was when the Whigs came in power—to a horizontal, ad valorem duty of 20 per cent. This was the gentleman who did vote a tax on tea and coffee in 1832, when the Treasury was overflowing with an annual surplus of \$6,000,000; yet, when the revenue was reduced to about one-half of the annual expenditure, under the compromise act, he was opposed to increasing the tariff, and is now bitterly opposed to the tariff of 1842, as is every organ in his interest in Tennessee. They denounce it as the "black tariff," as a system of plunder, by which the poor are robbed, for the benefit of the rich manufacturer and capitalist. The country will judge between the two systems of policy. Under the one, we have passed through a terrible ordeal of many years of suffering, of deep, universal distress. Under the other the country has risen up, refreshed and vigorous, like a strong man from sleep; every interest, every branch of industry, is reviving and prospering beyond any thing that we have witnessed for many long years; and, with steadiness in the present tariff policy, and the re-establishment of a sound national currency, we may soon expect a return of national prosperity never exceeded in the palmiest days of the Republic.

## APPENDIX.

*From the Globe of May 22, 1844.*

The naval appropriation bill being under consideration—

Mr. A. JOHNSON observed that he did not know that the remarks he was about to make would be considered strictly in order; but inasmuch as the debate had taken rather a wide range, he trusted it would not be considered improper for him to discuss the means by which money now proposed to be appropriated was drawn from the people.

He should oppose this bill more in consequence of the manner in which the money it appropriated was raised, than for any other consideration; and he held that an examination of the system by which the revenues of the Government were raised was a legitimate course of argument. Ever since this Congress had been in session, there appeared to him to have been a disposition to indulge in the wildest and most visionary schemes of expenditure. Mr. J. here referred to various items of expenditure, such as dry docks, navy yards, &c., and particularly to the two river and harbor bills, involving an expenditure of one million two hundred thousand dollars. He was opposed to the appropriations in this bill, in consequence of the system by which the money was procured. We have been told (said he) by some of the gentlemen of this House, in a document published by them, of the evils of direct taxation; and he would therefore say a word or two on that subject. He was not an advocate for direct taxation; but he held that it would be a cheaper and more equitable mode of collecting the revenue than the present one. At all events, a system of direct taxation would put an end to all these extravagant and visionary schemes of expenditure that were now resorted to. In the publication he referred to, the authors supposed that the annual revenues collected for this Government would be something like thirty-six millions; and when they came to the State of Tennessee, they showed that if this money was to be collected by direct taxes, the people of that State would be alarmed at the proportion they were to pay, which was estimated at \$1,700,000. This was an admission, however, that the money was collected from the people. Now, how is it proposed to collect this \$1,700,000 of the people of Tennessee, but by indirect taxation? It was proposed to collect it by a mode under which the people would not know the amount collected from them; that is, to take the money out of their pockets by deception, or, in other words, by the operation of the tariff. Now, if the Southern States would look closely into the subject, they would find that such a system of taxation bore more hardly on them than any other.

He went on to contend that there were greater advantages to the people in direct taxation for the support of the Government, for thereby much would be saved to the hard-working people. But they were told that this expensive plan of collecting revenue must be persisted in for the protection of home industry; or, in other words, this system must be persisted in, that the few might be benefited at the expense of the many. It was admitted that \$36,000,000 must be collected for the support of the Government, and this sum was made by the importing merchants to form part of the first cost of the goods. The merchants transmitted those goods to various parts of this Union for sale, adding thereon fifty per cent. as profit; and thus it would be seen that the hard-working consumer not only paid \$36,000,000 for the support of the Government to benefit a few manufacturers, but fifty per cent. thereon as profit of the merchant.

He contended that the argument was very clear in favor of a system by which each State should collect and provide its proportionate share of the revenue which was necessary for the Government. By such a system, much would be saved in the cost of collection. He calculated that of the \$1,700,000 which Tennessee would supply, she could save \$92,000, which was an important sum. He then showed the operation of the protective system on the mechanic, proving that, in relation to the mechanic classes, this protection of home industry was a system of humbug, by which no one was benefited but the wealthy manufacturer. Indeed, to the working classes it was an iniquitous system of taxation. But (he inquired) was the system for which the people were so honestly taxed a protection of home industry? Of the amount of capital vested in manufactures and in agriculture, he said this system caused \$500 vested in manufactures to yield \$72—more than 1,000 vested in agriculture; and yet they were protecting home industry! To be perfect, the protection of home industry must be its protection by the several and individual States within their own chartered limits; but if that were resorted to, they would hear less of protection of home industry.

Upon such a principle as this, they might go on increasing the amount of duties progressively, until they brought down the price of the articles to nothing at all. The Government would then be in the receipt of a large revenue from duties on imports, and the goods imported would be procured by the consumer for nothing. Was there ever a greater absurdity attempted to be palmed off upon the public? It was an insult to the intelligence of the people.

Another extraordinary proposition contained in this literary curiosity, to which he had already referred, was that we were actually buying five dollars' worth of foreign articles for every dollar's worth that we sold of our own. Was there ever a country that was prosperous and happy while she bought more than she sold? How long would a Government exist under such circumstances?

Mr. STEWART said, if the gentleman would examine the argument in that report, he would see, not that we purchased five dollars' worth of foreign articles for every dollar's worth that we sold of our own, but that we purchase and consume, in the form of manufactured goods, five dollars' worth of agricultural produce for every dollar's worth of agricultural produce that we export.

Mr. JOHNSON proceeded. The gentleman might attempt to explain the matter, but it clearly put him to as great difficulty to understand himself, as it did him, (Mr. JOHNSON,) to understand him. Was the gentleman unacquainted with that plain principle of political economy, that when the balance of trade exists against a Government, that Government must decline in proportion to the extent of that balance? But they were called upon to imitate the example of Great Britain, and the prosperity of that country had been greatly vaunted. Prosperous! yes; prosperous in the creation of a national debt; prosperous in the imposition of burdens upon the people; prosperous in building up an aristocracy. He might refer to various authorities to show the prosperous condition of Great Britain, but he would not unnecessarily detain the committee.

Mr. J. adverted to the distributive policy as a concomitant of the high protective tariff. Who, he asked, was the great advocate of that policy—a policy by which the people became the recipients of a bounty first collected from themselves. The advocate of this strange mode of enriching the people was the man who was to be placed at the head of the administration of this Government—the man who was at one time found advocating the principles of one party, and sometimes of another.

Mr. J. next adverted to the alleged dissensions in the Democratic ranks. For his own part, he intended to act for himself, and, as to any insinuations that had been spread abroad in reference to him, he repelled them. He did not admit the right of any individual to set himself up as the supervisor or censor of all who belonged to the Democratic party, and to institute a Procrustean bed for their opinions.



3 0112 061614324